

Advisory Circular

Subject:

Y

AIRPLANE SIMULATOR QUALIFICATION

Date: 1/24/9.2 Initiated by:450A205 **AENe: 120-403** Change: 1

I. PURPOSE: This Change clarifies procedures for the requalification of simulators which have been removed from active status for prolonged periods. Paragraph 10, Recurrent Evaluation, subpart f(5),, has created some confusion concerning the establishment of new qualification basis for simulators which have been out of service longer than 1 year. It was not originally intended that simulators out of service for 1 year or longer automatically establish a new qualification status. Additionally, this Change corrects a reference number that was incorrect in the original advisory circular. It also inserts an effective date that was inadvertently omitted from the original advisory circular.

The Change number and date of the changed material are carried at the top of the page. Pages having no changes retain the same heading information.

2 <u>PRINCIPAL CHANGES</u>: Paragraph **10**, <u>Recurrent Evaluation</u>, subpart **f(5)**, has been edited and a new subpart, **f(6)**, has been added to **clarify** procedures for the requalification of inactive simulators.

PAGE CONTROL CHART

Remove Pages	Dated	Insert Pages	Dated
-			
1	7/29/901	1	7/29/91
2	7/29/91	2	11/224//9922
9	7/29/91	9	7/29/91
10	7/29/91	10	1/224/992
11	7/29/91	11	7/29/91
12	7/29/91	12	1/224/2922
Appendix 2			
9	7/29/91	9	7/29/91
10	7/29/91	10	1/24/92
11	7/29/91	11	1/24/92
12	7/29/91	12	7/29/91

PAGE CONTROL CHART

Remove Pages	Dated	Insert Pages	Dated
Appendix 3			
5 6	7/29 //91 7/29 //91	5 6	1 <i> 2</i> 24 <i> 5</i> 92 7/29 //91

Director, Flight Standards Service



Advisory Circular

Subject:

AIRPLANE SIMULATOR QUALIFICATION

Date: 7/29/91 Initiated by: ASS-205 ACINa: 120-408

Change:

PURPOSE. This advisory circular (AC) provides an acceptable means, but not the only means, of compliance with the Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) regarding the evaluation and qualification of airplane simulators used in training programs or airmen checking under Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Criteria specified in this AC are those used by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to determine whether a simulator is qualified and the qualification level. While these guidelines are not mandatory, they are derived from extensive FAA and industry experience in determining compliance with the pertinent FAR. Mandatory terms used in this AC such as "shall" or "must" are used only in the sense of ensuring applicability of this particular method of compliance when the acceptable method of compliance described herein is used. Applicable regulations must also be referenced to assure compliance with the provisions therein. This AC does not change regulatory requirements or create additional ones, and does not authorize changes in, or deviations from, regulatory requirements. The provisions of the FAR are controlling. This document does not interpret the regulations. Interpretations are issued only under established agency procedures. This AC applies only to the evaluation of airplane simulators. See, for example, AC 120-45, Advanced Training Devices (Airplane Only) Evaluation and Qualification.

CANCELLATION. AC 120040A, Airplane Simulator and Visual System Evaluation, dated July 31, 1986, is canceled, Operators having simulator improvement or acquisition projects in progress on the effective date of this advisory circular have 90 days from the effective date to notify the National Simulator Program Manager (NSPM) of those projects which the operator desires to complete under the provisions of AC 120,40A.

61,3 RELATED A; FAR FAR SECTIONS. Secti63.39, FAR Part H; FI63 Secti61.57C; F61.58, Sections121,407,61.157, 121.409, FAR Part Appendix

121.439, and 121.441; FAR Part 121 Appendices E, F, and H; FAR Sections 125.285, 125.287, 125.291, and 125.297; and FAR Sections 135.293, 135.297, 135.323, and 135.335.

4. RELATED READING MATERIAL. AC 120-29C, Criteria for Approval of Category III Landing Weather Minima; AC 120-29, Criteria for Approving Category I and Category II Landing Minima for FAR 121 Operators; AC 120-35B, Line Operational Simulations: Line-Oriented Flight Training, Special Purpose Operational Training, Line Operational Evaluation; AC 120-41, Criteria for Operational Approval of Airborne Wind Shear Alerting and Flight Guidance Systems; AC 120-45, Advanced Training Devices (Airplane Only) Evaluation and Qualification; AC 120-46, Use of Advanced Training Devices (Airplane Only); AC 150/5300-13, Airport Design; AC 150/5340-IF, Marking of Paved Areas on Airports; AC 120-150/5340-4C, Installation Details for Runway Centerline Touchdown Zone Lighting Systems; AC 150/5340-19, Taxiway Centerline Lighting System; AC 150/5340-24, Runway and Taxiway Edge Lighting System; and AC 150-5345.228D, Precision Approach Path Indicator (PAPI) Systems.

AC 120-40B CHG 1 1/24/992

5. BACKGROUND.

a*. The availability of advanced technology has permitted greater use of flight simulators for training and checking of flight crewmembers. The complexity, costs, and operating environment of modern aircraft also has encouraged broader use of advanced simulation. Simulators can provide more indepth training than can be accomplished in airplanes and provide a very high transfer of learning and behavior from the simulator to the airplane. The use of simulators, in lieu of airplanes, results in safer flight training and cost reductions for the operators. It also achieves fuel conservation and reduction in adverse environmental effects.

- b. As technology progressed and the capabilities of flight simulation were recognized, FAR revisions were made to permit the increased use of simulators in approved training programs. Simulators have been used in training and some checking programs since the middle 1950's. Various FAR amendments gradually permitted additional simulator credits. The most significant recognition of simulator capability has occurred since the early 19770's. In December 1973, FAR Amendments 61-62 and 121-108 permitted, additional use of visual simulators. Amendments to FAR Section 121.439 permitted simulators approved for "the landing maneuver" to be substituted for the airplane in a pilot recency of experience These changes to the FAR constituted a significant step toward qualification. the development of Amendments 61-69 and 121-161 issued June 24, 1980, with contained the FAA Advanced Simulation Plan. To support this plan, the National Simulator Evaluation Program was established by the FAA in October 1980. program is administered and directed by the NSPM..
- c.. The need for standard criteria was necessitated by the use of simulators for training and checking. The evolution of the simulator technology and the concomitant increased permitted use has required a similar evolution of the criteria for simulator qualification. A listing of known simulator criteria should, therefore, be informative. The qualification basis for a given simulator may be any of the past criteria, depending on when the simulator was first approved or last upgraded. The following list provides the effective dates of simulator qualification criteria documents:

FAR Part 121 , Appendix B	1//99/6635 to 2/2//7700
AC 121-14	12/19 /669 to 2/9 //7/6
AC 121-148	2/9//76 to 10/16//78 8
AC 121-14B	10/16//78 to 8/29/80
FAR Part 121 , Appendix H	6/30/800 to Present
AC 121-14 C	8/29/80 to 1//311/883
AC 120-40	1//3311/8833 to 7/31/886
AC 120-40A	7/31 /886 to 7/29 /9911

Each of these documents has addressed the greater complexity represented by succeeding generations of simulators. Complexity of the highest level is not, however, required of all simulators. In fact, simulators are divided into levels



operator.

- (7) **SOC** with certain requirements. **SOC's** must provide references to sources of information for showing compliance, rationale to explain how the referenced material is used, mathematical equations and parameter values used, and conclusions reached. Refer to appendix 1 stimulator Standards," comments column, for **SOC** requirements.
 - $\textbf{(8)} \ \ \text{Recording procedures or required equipment for the validation tests}.$
 - **(9)** The following for each validation test designated in appendix 2 of this AC:
 - (i) Name of the test.
 - (ii) Objective of the test.
 - (iii) Initial conditions.
 - (iv) Manual test procedures.
 - (v) Automatic test procedures (if applicable).
 - (vi) Method for evaluating simulator validation test results.
 - (vii) Tolerances for relevant parameters.
 - (viii) Source of Airplane Test Data (document and page number).
 - (ix) Copy of Airplane Test Data.
 - (x) Simulator Validation Test Results as obtained by the
 - (xi) A means, acceptable to the **NSPM**, of easily comparing the simulator test results to airplane test data.
 - The operator's simulator test results must be recorded on a multiidamel recorder, line printer, or other appropriate recording media acceptable to the NSPM. Simulator results should be labeled using terminology common to airplane parameters as opposed to **computer** software identifications. These results should be easily compared with the supporting data by employing cross-plotting, overlays, transparencies, or other acceptable means. data documents included in an ATG may be photographically reduced only if such reduction will not alter the graphic scaling or cause difficulties in scale interpretationor resolution. Incremental scales on graphical presentations must provide the resolution necessary for evaluation of the parameters shown in appendix 2. The test guide will provide the documented proof of compliance with the simulator validation tests in appendix 2. In the case of a simulator an operator should run all validation tests for the requested qualification level. Validation test results offered in a test guide for a previous initial or upgrade evaluation should not be used to validate simulator performance in a test guide offered for a current upgrade. For tests involving time histories, flight test data sheets, or transparencies thereof, and simulator test results should beclearly markedwith appropriate reference points to ensure an accurate comparison between simulator and airplane with respect to time. Operators using line printers to record time histories should clearly mark that information taken from the line printer data output for cross-plotting on the airplane data. The cross-plotting of the operator's simulator data to airplane

AC'120-40B CHG \$ 1/24/92

data is essential to verify simulator performance in each test. During an evaluation, the FAA will devote its time to detailed checking of selected tests from ,the AT&. The FAA evaluation serves to validate the operator's simulator test results.

- d The completed ATG and the operator's compliance letter and request for the evaluation will be submitted through the operator% POT. The POI will then submit the total package with a letter or memorandum of endorsement to the NSPM. The ATG will be reviewed and determined to be acceptable prior to scheduling an evaluation of the simulator.
- e. A copy of an ATG for each type simulator by each simulator manufacturer will be required for the NSPM's file. The NSPM may elect not to retain copies of the ATG for subsequent simulators of the same type by a particular manufacturer, but will determine the need for copies on a case-by-case basis. Data updates to an original ATG should be provided to the NSPM in order to keep FAA file copies current.
- f. The operator may elect to accomplish the ATG validation tests while the similator is at the manufacturer's facility. Tests at the manufacturer's facility should be accomplished the latest practical time prior to disassembly and shipment. The operator must thenvalidate simulator performance at the final location by repeating at least one-third of the validation tests -in the, ATG and submitting those tests to the NSPM. After review of these tests, the FAA will schedule an initial evaluation. The ATG must be clearly annotated to indicate when and where each test was accomplished.
- In the event an operator moves a simulator to a new location and its level of qualification is not changed, the following procedures shall apply:
 - (1) Advise the POI and NSPM of the move.
- (2) Prior to returning the simulator to service at the new location, the operator should perform a typical recurrent validation and functions test. The results of such tests will be retained by the operator and be available for inspection by the FAA at the next evaluation or as requested.
 - (3) The NSPM may schedule an evaluation prior to return to service.
- h When there is a change of operator, the new operator must accomplish all requiredadministrative procedures including the submission of the currently approved Master Approval Test Guide (MATG) through the POI to the NSPM. The ATG must be identified with the new operator by displaying the operator's name or logo! The POI will then submit the package as described in paragraph 9d above. * The simulator may, at the discretion of the NSPM, be subject to an evaluation in accordance with the original qualification criteria. However, a simulator having Phase I status resulting from a landing maneuver approval under AC 121-144B must meet the Phase I requirements in FAR Part 121, Appendix H, in the event of the sale or transfer of the simulator from one operator to another.

- i. The scheduling priority. from initial and upgrade evaluations will be based on the sequence in which acceptable ATC's and evaluation requests are received by the NSPM.
- L. The ATG will be approved after the completion of the initial or upgrade evaluation and all discrepancies in the ATG have been corrected. This document) after inclusion of the FAA witnessed test results, becomes the MATG. The MATG will then remain in the custody of the operator for use in future recurrent evaluations.

10. RECURRENEVALUATIONS

- a. For a simulator to retain its qualification, it will be evaluated on a recurrent basis using the approved MATG. Unless otherwise determined by the NSPM, recurring evaluations will be accomplished every 4 months by a Simulator Evaluation Specialist. Each recurrent evaluation, normally scheduled for 8 hours of simulator time, will consist of functions tests and approximately one-third of the validation tests in the MATG. The MATG is to be completed annually.
- b Dates of recurrent evaluations will normally not be scheduled beyond **30** day; of the date due. Exceptions to this policy will be considered by the **INSPM** on a case-by-case basis to address extenuating circumstances.
- c. In the interest of conserving simulator time, the..following Optional Test Program (OTP) is an alternative to the 8-hour recurrent evaluation procedure:
- (1) Operators of simulators having the appropriate automatic recording and plotting capabilities may apply for evaluation under the **OTP.**
- (2) Operators must notify the NSPM in writing of their intent to enter the OTP. If the FAA determines that the evaluation can be accommodated with 4 hours or less of simulator time, recurrent evaluations for that simulator will be planned for 4 hours. If the 4-hour period is or will be exceeded and the operator cannot extend the period, then the evaluation will be terminated and houst be completed within 30 days to maintain qual-iif ication status. The FM with then reassess the appropriateness of the OTP.
- be performed and certified by operator .personnel between FAA recurrent evaluations. Complete coverage will be required through any three consecutive recurrent evaluations. These tests and results will be reviewed by the FM Simulator Evaluation, Specialist at the outset of each evaluation. The one-third of validation tests executed for each recurrent evaluation should be accomplishedwithin the 30 days prior to the scheduled evaluation or accomplished on an evenly distributed basis during the 4-month period preceding the scheduled evaluation. Twenty percent of those tests conducted by the operator for each recurrent evaluation will then be selected and repeated by the Simulator Evaluation Specialist along with 10 percent of those tests not performed by the operator.

AC 1120-440B CHG 1 1/224/592

d. With appropriate arrangement and understanding between the operator and 222, an extended interval recurrent evaluation schedule based on semiannual PM (Expections can be arranged. The extended interval evaluation schedule relies on quarterly checks by the operator.'

- e. Prior to arrival for an on-site evaluation, the FAA inspector will notify the operator if any tests are planned to be run that may require special beguipment to technicians. These tests would include latencies, control dynamics,? sounds and vibrations, or motion system tests,
- f. In instances where an operator plans to **remove** a simulator from active **status**'for prolonged periods, the following procedures shall apply to requalify the simulator pursuant to this AC:
- (1) The NSPM and POI shall be advised in writing. The notice shall contain an estimate of the period that the simulator will be inactive.
- (2) Recurrent evaluations will not be scheduled during the inactive period. The NSPM will remove the simulator from qualified status on a mutually established date not later than the date on which the first missed recurrent evaluation would have been scheduled.
- (3) Before a simulator can be restored to FAA qualified status:, it will require an evaluation by the NSPM. The evaluation content and time required for accomplishment will be based on the number of recurrent evaluations missed during the inactive period. For example, if the simulator were out of service for 1 year, it would be necessary to complete the entire test guide since under the recurrent evaluation program, the MATG is to be completed annually.
- (4)) The operator will notify the NSPM of any changes to the original schedulad time out of service.
- (5) The simulator will normally be requalified using the FAM-approved MANG and criteria that was in effect prior to its removal from qualification; however, in a ctive periods exceeding 1 year will require a review of the qualification basis.
 - (6) If these procedures $a \ r \ e$ not possible, the establishment of a new qualification basis will be necessary.

11. SPECIAL FEMALUATIONS.

- a. Between recurring evaluations, if deficiencies are discovered or it becomes apparent that the simulator is not being maintained to initial qualification standards, a special evaluation of the simulator may be conducted by the NSPM to verify its status.
- b. The simulator will lose its qualification when the NSPM can no longer ascertkin maintenance of the original simulator validation criteria based on a recurrent or special evaluation. Additionally, the POI shall advise the operator and the NSPM if a deficiency is jeopardizing training requirements, and arrangerents shall be made to resolve the deficiency in the most effective manners, including the withdrawell of approval by the POI.

12 Par 10

TABLE OF VALIDATION TESTS (Cont'd)

I = Initial Evaluation
R = Recurrenty Evaluation

Test			dest.	Tolerance	•				on.	Comments	
2.,	UAND	r.Twe	OBAUTTIES (DYNAMIC CONTR							1	
۷.,			Roll Control	same as (1) above.	Talksofff, Cruise,, Landing			IR	IR	Data should be normal control displacement. Approximately 25% to 50% of full throw.	
		(3)	Yaw Control	Same as (1) above.	Takeoff, Cruise, Landing			IR	IR	Data tenduid demnormal control displacement. Approximately 25% to 50% of full throw.	
	€	LONG	ITUDINAL					1			
		(1)	PowertwChange IPymanics	#3 Kts Airspeed +100 Feet (30 Neters)) Altitude #20% or +1.50 Pitch	Approach to GoPAround	IR	IR Ł	IR	IR	Wing flaps should remain im the apprecia position. Tin history of uncontrolled free response for tin increase the initiation of the configuration change to 15 seconds after completion of the configuration change.	
		(2)	Flap/Slat Chinge Dynamics	23 Rts Airspeed 2100 Fest (30 Heters) Altitude 220% or 21.5° Pitch	Retraction, After Takeoff. Rationsion, Approach to Landing	IR IR		IR IR		Tilenhistory of uncontrolled from response fortine inframent from 5 meetrils before the initiation of the configuration change to 15 seconds after completion of the configuration thange.	
		(3)	Spoiler/Speedbrake Change Dynamics	±3 Kts Airspeed ±100 Feet (30 Meters) Altitude ±20% or ±1.5. Pitch	Cruise and Approach	IR	IR	IR	KR	Time limitory of miscontrolled free response for time incrementation is accords before the initiation of the configuration change to 15 Gaconde after the configuration change.	

TABLE OF VALIDATION TESTS (Cont'd)

I = Initial Evaluation R = Recurrent Evaluation

	7	est.	•				cati ment		Comments	
•	HAMOT TWO		IA1		A	В	С	D		
2.		GOALITIES (LONGITUDINAL CO	+3 Kts Airspeed +100 Feet (30 Heters) Altitude +20% or +1.5° Pitch	Takeoff to Second Segment Climb, Approach to Landing	IR	IR	IR	ÎŘ	Time history of uncontrolled free response for a time increment of 5 seconds before the initiation of the configuration change to 15 seconds after the completion of the configuration change.	
	(5)	Gear and Flap/Slat Operating Times	21 second or 10% of Time %	Takeoff, Approach	1R	£TR	IR	IR	Hornel and alternate flaps, extension and retraction. Hornel gear, extension and retraction. Alternate gear, extension only.	
	(6)	Longitudinal Trim	±1 Pitch Control (Stab and Elev) ±1 Pitch Angle ±5% Het Thrust or Equivalent	Cruise, Approach, Landing	IR	IR	IR	IR	May be Snapshot Tests.	
	(7)	Leithitchia Managering Stability (Stick Force/g)	±5 lbs (±2.224 daN) or ±10% Column Force or Equivalent Surtage	Cruing, Approach, Landing	IR	IR	IR	IR	May he service of Suspendit Niets. Force or surface Afflection must be in coursely Approximately 28, 30 ,, and 45 hark-inglembould be presented	
	(8)	Longitudinal Static Stability	<pre> ±5 lbs (£2.224 dail) or £10% Column Force or Equivalent Surface </pre>	Approach	IR	IR	IR	IR	Data for at least 2 speeds above 2 and 22 speeds above 2 for in speed. May be a series of Snapshot Tests.	

SEC.

10

I = Initial Evaluation R = Recurrent Evaluation	Coments			Stall Warning Signal should be recorded and must occur in the proper relation to stall.	Test should include 3 full cycles (6 overshoots after imput completed) or that sufficient to determine time to 1/2 amplitude whichever is less.			V _{MCB} may be defined by a performance or control limit which prevents demonstration of V _{MCB} in the conventional marmer.	Test with normal wheel deflection (about 30%). *
L Eval	8	Q		Ħ	£ .	IR		Œ.	IR
itia] curre	Quelification Requirement	Ü		Ħ .	Ĕ	HI		E	Ħ
# 2	a in a	B		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	H		Ħ	Ħ
H #	32	_		<u> </u>	<u> </u>			<u> </u>	<u>e</u>
IABLE OF VALIDATION IESTS (Cont'd)	Flight Condition			Second Segment Climb and Approach or Landing	Cruise	Cruise		Takeoff or Landing (Whichever is most critical in airplane)	Cruise and Approach or Landing
TABLE OF VAL	Tolerance		con't)	+3 kts Airspeed +2 Bank for speeds higher than stick shaker or initial buffet	±10% of Period ±10% of Time to 1/2 or Double Amplitude or ±.02 of Damping Ratio	+1,5 Pitch or +2 /sec. Pitch Rate +.10g Normal Acceleration	č	±3 Kts Airspeed	±10% or ±2 /sec. Roll Rate
Par	**		2. HANDLING QUALITIES (LONGITUDINAL Con't)	(9) Stick Shaker, Airframe Buffet, Stall Speeds	(10) Phugoid Dynamics	(11) Short Period Dynamics	d. LATERAL DIRECTIONAL	(1) Minimum Control Speed, Air (V _{MCR}), per Applicable Airworthiness Standard Or Low Speed Engine Inoperative Handling Characteristics in Air	(2) Roll Response (Rate)

rr					•	-		
I = Initial Evaluation R = Recurrent Evaluation	Comments		Roll rate response.	Airplans data averaged from multiple tests may be used. Test for both directions.	May be Brapshot Tests.	Test with stability augmentation OH and OFF. Rudder step input of approximately 25% rudder pedal throw.	Test for at least 6 cycles With stability augmentation OFF.	May be a series of Snapshot Tests.
i i	S.	Q	Ħ	II	IR	ai .	KI	Ĕ
Liell Fre	1	υ	Ħ	fi .	g	E.B.	EI .	Z.R
	Qualification Requirement	g	ä	Ħ	E E	E	5	E.
H H	9	A	IR	Ħ	13	IR		IR
TABLE OF VALIDATION THEIS (Cont'd)	Flight Condition		Approach or Landing	Cruise	Second Segment and Approach or Landing	Approach or Landing	Cruise and Approach or Landing	Approach or Landing
TABLE OF VALID	Tolerance	TOBAL Conit)	±10% or ±2 /sec.	Correct Trend, ±2 Bank or ±10% in 20 Seconds	tl Rydder Angle or tl Tab Angle or Equivalent Pedal	<u>+2</u> /sec. or <u>+10%</u> Yaw Rate	±0.5 sec. or ±10% of Period. ±10% of Time to 1/2 or Double Amplitude or ±.02 of Damping Ratio. ±20% or ±1 sec. of Time Difference Between Peaks of Bank and Sideslip.	For a given rudder position +2 Bank, +1 Sidmelip, +10t or +2, Aileron, +10t or +5 Spoiler or Equivalent Wheel Position
	Zest	HANDLING OUBLITIES (LATERAL DIRECTIONAL) Roll Response to Roll Controller Step Input) Spiral Stability	5) Engine Inoperative Trim) Rudder Response) Dutch Roll, Yew Demper OFF) Steady State Sideslip
		ANDLE	(3)	(4)	(3)	9)	(7)	(8)
12								

TABLE OF FUNCTIONS AND SUBJECTIVE TESTIS (Contid)	Sl	SIMULATOR L				
	A	В	C	D		
(ii) Maximum rate.		 				
(iii) Manuala liftlight control reversion.						
(v) Other.						
e. <u>APPROACHES</u>						
(1) Nonprecision.	X	х	X.	X		
(i) Approach procedure(s), one or more of the following.						
NDB VOR, RNAV, TACAN DME ARC LOC/BC LDA, LOC, SDF ASR		•.	+ 3			
(ii) Hissed approach.						
(iii) All engines operating.						
(iv) One or more engines inoperative.	1					
(2) Precision.	X	х	Х	Х		
(i) PAR.]]		
(i i) ILS.						
(A) Normal.					 	
(B) Engine(s) inoperative.]				
(C) Category I published approach.						
1 Manually controlled with and without flight director to 100 ft. (30 m.) below CAT I minima.		ę				

¥

TABLE OF FUNCTIONS AN	SIMULTOR LEVEL					
			A	B	С	D
demonstrated) .		With crosswind (maximum				
3		With windshear.				
(D) Ca	ateg	gory II published approach				
throttle, autoland.	-	Autocoupled, auto-				
missed approach.		All engines operating				
approach.	ate	gory III published			ż	
1		With generator failure.		, .	ıt.	
<u>2</u>		With 10 knot tailwind.				
<u>a</u>		With 10 knot crosswind,				
4		One engine inoperative.				
(iii) Missed	арр	proach.				
(A) A	11 (engines operating.				
(B) Or	ne	or more engines inoperative.				
(3) Visual.			X	X	Χ	X
(i) Abnorn	nal	wing flaps/slats.				
(ii) Without	t g	lide slope guidance.				
f \ VISUAL SEGMENT A	AND	LANDING '				
(1) Normal .						
(i) Crosswi	nd	(maximum demonstrated).		X	Χ	x
(ii) From V	FR	traffic pattern.		 -(Res	 erved)
				l	1	